REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 29, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in response thereto. Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

The rejection of claims 1-3, 6-8, 17, 18, and 21 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Saindon is respectfully traversed. The present invention is an autonomous eclone that represents a user of a plurality of message media (e.g., telephone, voicemail, email, and video conferencing) and responds to incoming messages from a third person when the particular message media is unattended (i.e., the user is unavailable).

Claim 1 recites a system operable to represent a user of a plurality of message mediums and to independently respond to a person wishing to communicate with the user via an unattended one of said message mediums. The system includes a plurality of interface agents each coupled to a respective message medium and each operable to detect an unattended message received from the person, convert the unattended message into a written request, and relay a result to the person. A command creator converts the request into a database query and an expert system modifies the query by applying a collection of rules. A database stores information relating to the user and an output action generator accesses the database, executes the query thereby generating the result based on the information in the database, and relays the result to the interface agents. As a consequence of the recited structure, the invention autonomously provides an appropriate response to the unattended message so that the person can obtain desired information without waiting for the user to act.

Saindon relates to multimedia processing such as converting spoken audio into text. The cited reference lacks any teaching relevant to a plurality of messaging media wherein if a message medium used by a person wishing to communicate with the user is unattended by the user, then an interface agent operates on a message left by the person. Since Saindon fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1, it fails to establish an anticipation.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action mailed June 29, 2005, the "examiner notes that when a user participates in multi-tasking processes, then the user cannot be able to simultaneously accomplish two or more of the tasks and therefore it is inherent that receive message is the unattended message at some intervals of time." The rejection does not differentiate between the user of the message mediums and a person wanting to communicate with the user. All of the claims of the present application refer to these two different individuals. For example, claim 1 involves receiving an unattended message from the person, querying a database storing information relating to the user, and relaying a result to the person. The examiner's comment reflects the failure of the rejection to take into account this messaging aspect involving both a person and a user.

The text-to-speech and speech-to-text capabilities of Saindon are applied to web-enabled systems which operate in real time. There is no disclosure in Saindon of a plurality of interface agents coupled to respective message mediums wherein the agents can detect an unattended message or convert the unattended message into a request. The rejection refers to columns 22 and 23 of Saindon concerning "interactive events" as showing a command creator. In an interactive event there is no unattended message to convert into a database query. Therefore, the disclosure of Saindon fails to disclose these claim elements.

The expert system recited in claim 1 modifies a database query. The Rob-Cop expert system of Saindon relied on in the rejection fails to disclose any modifications of a query into a database. Moreover, the rejection does not even relate the expert system function in columns 19 and 20 to the database query that it relies on for the recited command creator. In claim 1, the expert system operates on the database query created by the command creator. Saindon lacks any similar teaching.

The database of claim 1 stores information about the user of the message mediums. Saindon refers to information about a live presenter being stored in a database, but the presenter is not at all analogous to a user of a message medium who can receive a message while the medium is unattended.

Since Saindon fails to disclose all the claimed aspects of the invention,

claim 1 is allowable. Independent method claim 17 likewise recites the detection of an unattended message, and is therefore likewise allowable.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 6-8, 18, and 21 recite additional features not shown by Saindon. Therefore, claims 1-3, 6-8, 17, 18, and 21 are all allowable.

The rejection of claims 4, 5, 9-16, 19, and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saindon in view of Hasan is respectfully traversed. Hasan fails to correct for the deficiencies of Saindon noted above. Thus, claims 4 and 5 are allowable.

Regarding claim 9, the person wishing to communicate with the user is authenticated and classified using an authenticator and a classifier. Claim 9 also includes substantially the same limitations as claims 1 discussed above. As noted above, Saindon fails to teach or suggest the interface agents, command creator, expert system, or database. Hasan fails to correct for these deficiencies. Thus, claim 9 and its dependent claims 10-14 are allowable.

Claims 15 and 16 include similar limitations and are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above.

Claims 19 and 20 depend from allowable claim 17 and are likewise allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, claims 1-21 are now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark L. Mollon
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: August 22, 2005
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)